

DANIEL J. BERGESON, Bar No. 105439  
[dbergeson@be-law.com](mailto:dbergeson@be-law.com)  
JOHN W. FOWLER, Bar No. 037463  
[jfowler@be-law.com](mailto:jfowler@be-law.com)  
MELINDA M. MORTON, Bar No. 209373  
[mmorton@be-law.com](mailto:mmorton@be-law.com)  
BERGESON, LLP  
303 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 500  
San Jose, CA 95110-2712  
Telephone: (408) 291-6200  
Facsimile: (408) 297-6000

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
VERIGY US, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

\*E-FILED - 12/12/07\*

VERIGY US, INC, a Delaware Corporation,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

ROMI OMAR MAYDER, an individual;  
WESLEY MAYDER, an individual; SILICON  
TEST SYSTEMS, INC., a California Corporation;  
and SILICON TEST SOLUTIONS, LLC, a  
California Limited Liability Corporation,  
inclusive,  
Defendants.

Case No. C07 04330 RMW (HRL)

**STIPULATION SELECTING ADR  
PROCESS [ADR L.R. 3-5]  
AND ORDER**

Judge: Honorable Ronald M. Whyte

Complaint Filed: August 22, 2007  
Trial Date: None Set

Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5.

The parties stipulate to participate in the following ADR process:

**Private Process:**

\_X\_ Private ADR (*mutually agreeable private mediator to conduct mediation*)

The parties agree to hold the ADR session by

\_X\_ the presumptive deadline (*The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.*)

**Private Process:**

\_X\_ Private ADR (*mutually agreeable private mediator to conduct mediation after parties have engaged in document discovery*)

(*For e-filers, please consult General Order No. 45, Section X regarding signatures.*)

Concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from all signatories

Dated: November 19, 2007                      /s/ Melinda M. Morton  
Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: November 21, 2007                      /s/ Kevin Pasquinelli  
Attorney for Defendants

SIGNATURE AND CERTIFICATION BY PARTIES AND LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL

Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 16 and ADR L.R. 3-5(b), the undersigned certifies that he has read either the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of California," on the Court's ADR Internet site <www.adr.cand.uscourts.gov>, discussed the available dispute resolution options provided by the Court and private entities, and considered whether this case might benefit from any of them.

Dated: November 19, 2007

/s/  
Kenneth M. Siegel for Plaintiff Verigy US, Inc.

SIGNATURE AND CERTIFICATION BY PARTIES AND LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL

Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 16 and ADR L.R. 3-5(b), the undersigned certifies that he or she has read either the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of California," on the Court's ADR Internet site <www.adr.cand.uscourts.gov>, discussed the available dispute resolution options provided by the Court and private entities, and considered whether this case might benefit from any of them.

Dated: November 19, 2007

/s/  
Melinda M. Morton, Counsel for Plaintiff

SIGNATURE AND CERTIFICATION BY PARTIES AND LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL

Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 16 and ADR L.R. 3-5(b), the undersigned certifies that he or she has read either the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of California," on the Court's ADR Internet site <www.adr.cand.uscourts.gov>, discussed the available dispute resolution options provided by the Court and private entities, and considered whether this case might benefit from any of them.

Dated: November 21, 2007

/s/

Romi Mayder for Defendants  
Romi Mayder, Silicon Test Systems, Inc.  
and Silicon Test Solutions, LLC

Dated: December 4, 2007

/s/

Wesley Mayder for Defendant  
Wesley Mayder

SIGNATURE AND CERTIFICATION BY PARTIES AND LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL

Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 16 and ADR L.R. 3-5(b), the undersigned certifies that he or she has read either the handbook entitled "Dispute Resolution Procedures in the Northern District of California," on the Court's ADR Internet site <www.adr.cand.uscourts.gov>, discussed the available dispute resolution options provided by the Court and private entities, and considered whether this case might benefit from any of them.

Dated: November 21, 2007

/s/  
Daniel S. Mount, Counsel for Defendants

1 II ORDER

2 Pursuant to the foregoing Stipulation Selecting ADR Process submitted by the parties, the  
3 captioned matter is hereby referred to private mediation.

4  
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6  
7 Dated: 12/12/07

*Ronald M. Whyte*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. JUDGE RONALD M. WHYTE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE